



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/755,635	01/05/2001	Robert E. Dvorak	BLFR 1001-1	4822
22470	7590	03/30/2009		
HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP			EXAMINER	
P O BOX 366			KARDOS, NEIL R	
HALF MOON BAY, CA 94019			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3623	
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		03/30/2009	PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/755,635	DVORAK ET AL.	
<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>		
Neil R. Kardos	3623		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2008.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 26-35,37,40-46 and 94 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 26-35,37,40-46 and 94 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ .
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/22/2008</u>	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

**DETAILED ACTION**

This is a **FINAL** Office Action on the merits in response to communications filed on December 22, 2008. Claim 94 has been amended. Currently, claims 26-35, 37, 40-46, and 94 are pending and have been examined.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed on December 22, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues the following:

- (A) There is a long-felt need in the art for effective grocery store planning. (Remarks, pages 6-8 and 12).
- (B) The disclosure of Garry is not enabling. (Remarks, pages 8-11).
- (C) Garry in view of Landvater does not teach "the abstraction of a named display fixture." (Remarks, pages 12).
- (D) Garry in view of Landvater does not teach "the capability of loading named display fixtures that may occupy different floor locations in different stores." (Remarks, page 12).
- (E) Garry in view of Landvater does not teach "for the items to be displayed, designating whether or not a quantity of the item at the store should be allowed to fall below the presentation quantity between deliveries." (Remarks, pages 12-13).
- (F) Garry in view of Landvater does not teach "wherein the action includes allocating delivery of the item after ordering from a supplier." (Remarks, page 14).

(G) Garry in view of Landvater does not teach "wherein the simulating includes selecting the larger of the presentation quantities or the simulated sales for the item at the stores." (Remarks, page 16).

Applicant's arguments will now be addressed in turn:

**(A) There is a long-felt need in the art for effective grocery store planning.**

First, to be given substantial weight in the determination of obviousness or nonobviousness, evidence of secondary considerations (such as a long-felt need in the art) must be relevant to the subject matter **as claimed**. See MPEP 716.01(b). Applicant has not established a "nexus" between the merits of the claimed invention and the evidence of secondary considerations. Instead, Applicant has generally alleged that there is a long-felt need in the art for effective grocery store shelf planning, without relating these allegations to the claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant's allegation that there is a long-felt need in the art is not of probative value.

Furthermore, arguments of counsel cannot take the place of evidence in the record to show the solution of a long-felt need in the art. See MPEP 716.01(b)(II). Instead, objective evidence of a solution to a long-felt need must be factually supported by an appropriate affidavit or declaration to be of probative value. See MPEP 716.01(b)(I). Applicant has not submitted any such affidavit or declaration; thus, Applicant's allegations have no probative value.

Finally, even if Applicant's allegations were of probative value, Examiner is not persuaded by these allegations and maintains that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has been shown, as evidenced by the art of record.

**(B) The disclosure of Garry is not enabling.**

Regarding argument (B), Examiner respectfully disagrees. As per MPEP 2121, prior art is presumed to be operable/enabling when the prior art relied on expressly anticipates or makes obvious all of the elements of the claimed invention. Once such a reference is found, the burden is on Applicant to provide facts rebutting the presumption of operability. *In re Sasse*, 629 F.2d 675, 207 USPQ 107 (CCPA 1980). Garry was relied on to teach claim limitations directed to eliciting information from users and storing that information on a computer. One of ordinary skill in the art could have combined Garry's disclosure of the elicited information with his or her own knowledge to make the claimed invention.

**(C) Garry in view of Landvater does not teach "the abstraction of a named display fixture."**

Regarding argument (C), Examiner respectfully disagrees. First, the claims do not recite an "abstraction of a named display fixture," so it is not clear what limitation Applicant is referring to. Examiner believes Applicant is referring to the claimed "names for instances of a fixture type." On pages 2 and 5, Garry discloses gondolas and shelves as names for fixture types. Thus, Garry discloses this limitation.

**(D) Garry in view of Landvater does not teach "the capability of loading named display fixtures that may occupy different floor locations in different stores."**

Regarding argument (D), Examiner respectfully disagrees. First, the claims do not recite "loading named display fixtures that may occupy different floor locations in different stores," so it is not clear what limitation Applicant is referring to. Examiner believes Applicant is referring to the claimed "plurality of stores having different floor plans." On pages 5 and 6, Garry discloses inputting a store's product and shelving dimensions into the Spacemaster system. Thus, Garry discloses this limitation.

**(E) Garry in view of Landvater does not teach "for the items to be displayed, designating whether or not a quantity of the item at the store should be allowed to fall below the presentation quantity between deliveries."**

Regarding argument (E), Examiner respectfully disagrees. On page 6, Garry discloses that the Spacemaster does not assume fully stocked shelves. This also suggests that some programs do assume fully stocked shelves. Thus, it is well within the capabilities of one of ordinary skill in the art to designate whether or not fully stocked shelves will be assumed. Therefore, Garry suggests this limitation.

**(F) Garry in view of Landvater does not teach "wherein the action includes allocating delivery of the item after ordering from a supplier."**

Regarding argument (F), Examiner respectfully disagrees. First, Examiner maintains that the language of claim 94 ("lead time for an order or other action") makes the "other action" optional. Because Landvater discloses lead times for an order, the other actions are not required, and the claim limitations are met. See MPEP 2106(II)(C).

Furthermore, Applicant contends that "one of ordinary skill in the art understands that it takes more than just an order to make a item available in a store." (see Remarks, page 14). If this is so, then it would be obvious to include whatever actions it takes to make an item available in a store in the calculation of lead time, including allocating delivery of an item as claimed. Thus, the claim is rendered obvious by Applicant's admission.

**(G) Garry in view of Landvater does not teach "wherein the simulating includes selecting the larger of the presentation quantities or the simulated sales for the item at the stores."**

Regarding argument (G), Examiner respectfully disagrees. First, the limitation is unclear because it contains circular logic. How can the step of "simulating sales" include selecting "simulated sales?" Second, the claim contains the optional language "or the simulated sales." Because Landvater discloses selecting the larger of the presentation quantities (see column 14: lines 35-60, disclosing selecting the maximum presentation quantity), and the simulated sales are not required, the claim limitations are met. See MPEP 2106(II)(C).

Applicant incorporates by reference several arguments from the Response on August 6, 2007. (see Remarks, pages 13-15). In response to these arguments, Examiner incorporates by reference the response to arguments from the Office Action dated October 11, 2007.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 26-35, 37, 40-46, and 94 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garry (Making Space Management Work) in view of Landvater (U. S. 6,609,101).**

Claim 94: Garry teaches a computer-implemented method of improving the efficiency of planning presentations and simulating demand and stocking requirements for items placed in standard display fixture types using in stores having different floor plans, including:

- eliciting from a first user a schedule of display fixtures to be used in a plurality of stores having different floor plans and storing the schedule in a data structure stored in computer readable memory (See page 2, section 1, page 4, sections 1-2, page 6, sections 1 and 3, wherein a first user produces a schedule of shelves and store plans for stores in a whole store chain), wherein the resulting schedule of named display fixtures includes
  - fixture identifiers for a plurality of fixture types (See page 2, page 4, section 1-2, and page 5, section 1, page 6, which discloses gondolas and shelves, and the spacing associated with these fixtures);
  - capacities of the fixture types to hold items (See page 6, sections 1 and 4);  
and

- names for instances of a fixture type used to present the items (See page 2 and page 5, section 1, which discloses gondolas and shelves);
- eliciting from a second user store-by-store schedule of named display fixtures used in the stores, wherein the stores have varying floor plans (See page 2, section 1, page 3, section 1, page 4, sections 1-2, wherein a second user modifies the generic planogram for a specific store);
- eliciting a plan to stock the named display fixtures with items to be displayed without requiring the knowledge of the varying floor plans of the stores, and storing the resulting stocking plan in a data structure stored in .computer readable memory (See page 2, section 1, page 4, sections 1-2, page 5, section 1, page 6, page 9, section 1), wherein the stocking plan for the named display fixtures includes
  - presentation quantities of items required (See page 2, section 1, page 4, sections 1-2, page 5, section 1, page 6, page 9, section 1).

However, while Garry discloses stocking considerations and shelf capacity, Garry does not expressly disclose eliciting from a third user a plan, wherein the stocking plan includes dates during which the items will be displayed at particular stores, modeling lead time with time elements which collectively represent the overall lead time for an order or other action to lead to stocking of the named display fixtures at particular stores, simulating sales of the items from the named display fixtures at the stores and calculating orders that would need to be placed for the items to accommodate the simulated sales, the order calculation using at least the selected overall lead time, the presentation dates, and the quantities; and outputting the calculated orders.

Landvater discloses:

- eliciting from a third user a plan, wherein the stocking plan includes dates during which the items will be displayed at particular stores (See column 14, lines 25-45, wherein display configurations are stored in the database. See figures 14 and 15, column 1, lines 40-50; column 2, lines 20-27, column 14, lines 25-65, column 15, lines 1-6 and 17-25, wherein the good has a time of display and quantities to be displayed);
- modeling lead time with time elements which collectively represent the overall lead time for an order or other action to lead to stocking of the display fixtures at particular stores (See column 8, lines 19-35, column 9, lines 50-62, column 10, lines 1-2 and 30-55, column 12, lines 10-30 and 40-55, wherein lead time for replenishments, based on the expected sales, is modeled by the system. See also column 14, line 59- column 15, line 25);
- simulating sales of the items from the named display fixtures at the stores and calculating orders that would need to be placed for the items to accommodate the simulated sales, the order calculation using at least the selected overall lead time, the presentation dates, and the quantities (See column 8, lines 19-35, column 9, lines 50-62, column 10, lines 1-2 and 30-55, column 12, lines 10-30 and 40-55, wherein sales are forecasted and modeled for a selling period to determine inventory and safety stock considerations, as well as replenishments, based on the expected sales. See also column 14, line 59-column 15, line 25); and
- outputting the calculated orders (See column 8, lines 25-40).

Garry discloses a computer program used to plan displays across a chain of stores and refining this plan for specific individual stores. Garry further discloses stocking considerations and shelf capacity associated with the display plans. Landvater discloses storing information concerning presentations and displays in the system and using this information to plan inventory. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the stocking and inventory planning aspects of Landvater in the display planning system of Garry in order to more accurately calculate the stock replenishments needed to maintain attractive displays by ensuring the capacity of the fixtures is accounted for. (See column 14, lines 25-35 and 55-65 of Landvater).

Claim 26: Garry discloses designating whether or not a quantity of an item at the selling location should be allowed to fall below the presentation quantity between deliveries (See page 6, which discusses how fully stocked shelves are not assumed based on a slush factor).

Claims 27-29: Garry does not expressly disclose time elements include delivery of the item from a stocking location, preparing the delivered item for sale, or collect data, review action recommendations, process data, pick goods at a stocking location, and ship the item to the selling location.

Landvater discloses wherein the time elements include delivery of the item from a stocking location (See figure 1, column 6, lines 45-67, column 8, lines 25-45, column 9, lines 1-25 and 55-67, column 13, lines 30-45 and 59-67, column 14, lines 25-65, which discloses a

Art Unit: 3623

stocking location) and preparing the delivered item for sale (See column 3, lines 10-30, column 8, lines 25-45, column 9, lines 1-25 and 55-67, column 14, lines 25- 65, which discloses setting up the display of the delivered good). Landvater further discloses wherein the time elements include time required to collect data, review action recommendations, process data, pick goods at a stocking location, and ship the item to the selling location (See column 3, lines 10-30, column 7, lines 1-25, column 8, lines 25- 45, column 9, lines 1-25 and 55-67, column 14, lines 25-65, column 16, lines 35-65)

Both Garry and Landvater are concerned with stocking shelves to maintain displays. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the time elements discussed by Landvater in the display planning system of Garry in order to more accurately calculate the stock replenishments needed to maintain attractive displays by ensuring the capacity of the fixtures is accounted for. See column 14, lines 25-35 and 55-65 of Landvater, and page 5, section 1, and page 6, section 4, of Garry.

Claims 30-34: Garry discloses timing of stock considerations for displays (page 5, section 1, and page 6, section 4), but does not expressly disclose time elements the include periodic dates for actions necessary to make the item available at the plurality of selling locations, time of distributing the good from one or more first level stocking locations to a plurality of second level stocking locations, time for distributing the item from one or more first level stocking locations to a plurality of second level stocking locations, distributing the item from a supplier through one or more stocking locations to a plurality of selling locations, or time

for distributing the item from a supplier through one or more stocking locations to a plurality of selling locations.

Landvater discloses wherein the time element further include periodic dates for actions necessary to make the item available at the plurality of selling locations (See figures 8 and 9, column 4, lines 20-40 and 54-66, column 10, column 11, lines 15-35, wherein time periods for forecasting are set in the system), time of distributing the good from one or more first level stocking locations to a plurality of second level stocking locations (See figure 1, column 3, lines 10-30, column 6, lines 45-67, column 7, lines 1- 25, column 8, lines 25-45, column 9, lines 1-25 and 55-67, wherein the good is distributed among level 2 and 3 stocking locations using a time element), time for distributing the item from one or more first level stocking locations to a plurality of second level stocking locations (See figure 1, column 3, lines 10-30, column 6, lines 45- 67, column 7, lines 1-25, column 8, lines 25-45, column 9, lines 1-25 and 55-67, wherein the good is distributed among level 2 and 3 stocking locations using a time element).

Landvater further teaches wherein the time elements include time for distributing the item from a supplier through one or more stocking locations to a plurality of selling locations (See figure 1, column 3, lines 10-30, column 6, lines 45-67, column 7, lines 1- 25, column 8, lines 25- 45, column 9, lines 1-25 and 55-67, wherein the good is distributed from a supplier to the selling location using a time element) and wherein the time elements include time for distributing the item from a supplier through one or more stocking locations to a plurality of selling locations (See figure 1, column 3, lines 10-30, column 6, lines 45-67, column 7, lines 1-25, column 8, lines 25-45, column 9, lines 1-25 and 55-67, column 14, lines 25-65, wherein the good is distributed from a supplier to the selling location using a time element).

Both Garry and Landvater are concerned with stocking shelves to maintain displays. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the time elements discussed by Landvater in the display planning system of Garry in order to more accurately calculate the stock replenishments needed to maintain attractive displays by ensuring the capacity of the fixtures is accounted for. See column 14, lines 25-35 and 55-65 of Landvater, and page 5, section 1, and page 6, section 4, of Garry.

Claims 35 and 37: Claim 94 recites "lead time for an order or other action". Thus, "other actions" are made optional by the claim language. Landvater discloses lead times for an order, and thus other actions are not required. See MPEP 2106 II (C).

Claim 40: Garry does not expressly disclose and Landvater teaches wherein simulating includes adding the presentation quantities and the projected demand requirements for the item at the selling locations (See column 8, lines 25-45, column 9, lines 1-25 and 55-67, column 10, lines 1-20, column 14, lines 25-65, column 15, lines 1-6 and 17-25, which discuss presentation quantities and demand requirements).

Garry discloses a computer program used to plan displays across a chain of stores and refining this plan for specific individual stores. Garry further discloses stocking considerations and shelf capacity associated with the display plans. Landvater discloses storing information concerning presentations and displays in the system and using this information to plan inventory. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the stocking and inventory planning aspects of Landvater in the display planning system

of Garry in order to more accurately calculate the stock replenishments needed to maintain attractive displays by ensuring the capacity of the fixtures is accounted for. (See column 14, lines 25-35 and 55-65 of Landvater).

Claims 41 and 44: Garry teaches selecting the presentation quantity to be the average presentation quantity for the location during the predetermined selling period and the largest presentation quantity associated with the item at the selling location for any day of the predetermined selling period (See page 6, sections 1, 2, and 4, wherein the largest presentation quantity is associated with the display. See also page 4, section 1, page 7, section 1, wherein an average is considered).

However, neither Garry nor Landvater expressly discloses selecting among a plurality of available approaches to calculating the presentation quantity.

Garry discloses selecting a presentation quantity for the displays, this average quantity/capacity being set in the system. Landvater also discloses selecting a presentation quantity by the system and further discloses calculating demand needs based on the presentation plan. It is old and well known in the art to provide user's with menus of choices from which the user can select a choice to be implemented by the software. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a menu for choosing an approach to select the type of presentation quantity value to use in order to more accurately calculate the stock replenishments needed to maintain attractive displays by ensuring the capacity of the fixtures is accounted for. (See column 14, lines 25-35 and 55-65 of Landvater).

Claims 42-43: Garry does not expressly disclose and Landvater teaches wherein the approach selected uses:

- a presentation quantity for the selling location on the first day of the predetermined selling period (See column 8, lines 25-45, column 9, lines 1-25 and 55-67, column 10, lines 1-20, column 14, lines 25-65, column 15, lines 1-6 and 17-25, which discuss presentation quantities).
- a presentation quantity on the day of the predetermined selling period when the good is received at the selling location (See column 8, lines 25-45, column 9, lines 1-25 and 55-67, column 10, lines 1-20, column 14, lines 25-65, column 15, lines 1-6 and 17- 25, which discuss presentation quantities).

However, neither Landvater nor Garry expressly discloses selecting among a plurality of available approaches to calculating the presentation quantity.

Garry discloses selecting a presentation quantity for the displays, this average quantity/capacity being set in the system. Landvater also discloses selecting a presentation quantity by the system and further discloses calculating demand needs based on the presentation plan. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the stocking and inventory planning aspects of Landvater.in the display planning system of Garry in order to more accurately calculate the stock replenishments needed to maintain attractive displays by ensuring the capacity of the fixtures is accounted for. (See column 14, lines 25-35 and 55-65 of Landvater).

Further, it is old and well known in the art to provide user's with menus of choices from which the user can select a choice to be implemented by the software. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a menu for choosing an approach to select the type of presentation quantity value to use in order to more accurately calculate the stock replenishments needed to maintain attractive displays by ensuring the capacity of the fixtures is accounted for. See column 14, lines 25-35 and 55-65 of Landvater.

Claim 45: Garry does not expressly discloses the simulating aspect of the claim, as set forth above with respect to claim 94. Landvater teaches simulating, wherein the simulating includes selecting the larger of the presentation quantities or the projected demand requirements for the item at the selling locations (See column 8, lines 25-45, column 9, lines 1-25 and 55-67, column 10, lines 20-50, column 14, lines 25-65, column 15, lines 1-6 and 17-25, which discuss presentation quantities at the maximum and minimum acceptable levels).

Garry discloses a computer program used to plan displays across a chain of stores and refining this plan for specific individual stores. Garry further discloses stocking considerations and shelf capacity associated with the display plans. Landvater discloses storing information concerning presentations and displays in the system and using this information to plan inventory. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the stocking and inventory planning aspects of Landvater in the display planning system of Garry in order to more accurately calculate the stock replenishments needed to maintain attractive displays by ensuring the capacity of the fixtures is accounted for. (See column 14, lines 25-35 and 55-65 of Landvater).

Claim 46: Garry teaches wherein the presentation quantity used is the presentation quantity for the selling location on the last day of the predetermined selling period (See page 4, section 1, page 6, sections 1, 2, and 4, page 7, section 1).

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Neil R. Kardos whose telephone number is (571) 270-3443. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Beth Boswell can be reached on (571) 272-6737. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Neil R. Kardos  
Examiner  
Art Unit 3623

NRK  
3/24/09

/Beth V. Boswell/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3623